

### REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated January 8, 2007. Claims 1 to 5, 8 to 14, 16 to 20, 23 to 29, 31 and 35 to 39 are pending in the application, of which Claims 1, 16, 31 and 37 to 39 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 1 to 5, 8 to 14, 16 to 20, 23 to 29, 31 and 35 to 39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Published Appln. No. 2002/0001495 (Mochizuki) in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,876,606 (Banno). Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

The present invention concerns transmitting print data to a printer which first requested to acquire the print data, and not transmitting the print data to a printer which subsequently requested to acquire the print data.

Further, the present invention provides the feature of transmitting, in a case where the transmission of the print data to the printer which first requested to acquire the print data did not succeed, the print data to another printer. In this case, the "another printer" is the printer which next requested to acquire the print data subsequent to the printer which first requested to acquire the print data. That is, the "another printer" is the printer which secondly requested acquisition of the print data.

Thus, according to the present invention, it is possible to reduce the problem of wastefully repeating transmission to the printer to which the transmission of the image data failed, even though a request from another printer has been received.

Claims 1, 16 and 31

Turning to specific claim language, amended independent Claim 1 is directed to an information processing apparatus which includes a holding unit adapted to hold print data; an issuing unit adapted to issue reference information corresponding to the print data held by the holding unit, to a plurality of printing apparatuses including at least a first printing apparatus and a second printing apparatus; a first receiving unit adapted to receive an acquisition request of the print data transmitted from the first printing apparatus on the basis of the reference information; a first transmission unit adapted to transmit the print data to the first printing apparatus in response to the acquisition request received by the first receiving unit; a judgment unit adapted to judge whether or not the transmission of the print data by the first transmission unit succeeded; a second receiving unit adapted to receive an acquisition request of the print data transmitted from the second printing apparatus on the basis of the reference information; and a second transmission unit adapted to not transmit the data to the second printing apparatus in response to the acquisition request transmitted from the second printing apparatus in a case where it is judged by the judgment unit that the transmission of the print data succeeded, and adapted to transmit the data to the second printing apparatus among the plurality of printing apparatuses in response to the acquisition request transmitted from the second printing apparatus in a case where it is not judged by the judgment unit that the transmission of the print data succeeded.

In contrast, Mochizuki discloses that a host computer transmits print data to a printer which first responded to a retrieval packet, but does not transmit the print data to a printer which next responded to the retrieval packet. However, Mochizuki does not at all

consider a case where the transmission of the print data to the printer which first responded to the retrieval packet does not succeed. In this connection, Mochizuki does not disclose or suggest that, in the above case, the host computer transmits the print data to a printer which next responded to the retrieval packet. Essentially, Mochizuki does not disclose that the host computer transmits the print data to any other printer when the transmission of the "first-selected" printer did not succeed.

Furthermore, Banno discloses that a host computer reads status information of a printer, selects a less-error printer based on the read status information, and transmits print data to the selected printer. However, Banno does not disclose that, when the transmission of the print data to the selected printer did not succeed, the host computer transmits the print data to a "second-selected" printer. Essentially, Banno does not at all consider, when the host computer determines the printer to which the print data is transmitted, whether the relevant printer requests to acquire the print data. In other words, Banno merely considers, in case of determining the printer to which the print data is transmitted, only whether the number of errors is few.

In addition, even if Mochizuki and Banno are combined, which Applicant does not concede is permissible, the combination fails to disclose or suggest all of the features of the present invention. That is, as described above, Mochizuki discloses that the print data is transmitted to, from among the plural printers, the printer which first responded, and Banno discloses that the print data is transmitted to the printer selected as having less number of errors. Thus, according to the combination of Mochizuki and Banno, the print data is transmitted to, from among the plural printers, the printer which first responded, and, when the transmission does not succeed, the printer having less

number of errors is selected, and the print data is transmitted to the selected printer. For example, in the case that the transmission does not succeed, even if a certain printer A requests to acquire print data, a printer B having less number of errors is selected, and the image data is transmitted to the printer B. At this time, it is not at all considered whether the certain printer A requested to acquire the print data as featured in Claim 1.

Accordingly, Mochizuki and Banno, either alone or in combination, neither disclose nor suggest a second transmission unit adapted to not transmit the data to the second printing apparatus in response to the acquisition request transmitted from the second printing apparatus in a case where it is judged by said judgment unit that the transmission of the print data succeeded, and adapted to transmit the data to the second printing apparatus among the plurality of printing apparatuses in response to the acquisition request transmitted from the second printing apparatus in a case where it is not judged by said judgment unit that the transmission of the print data succeeded as featured in Claim 1.

In light of the deficiencies of Mochizuki and Banno as discussed above, Applicant submits that amended independent Claim 1 is now in condition for allowance and respectfully requests same.

Amended independent Claims 16 and 31 are directed to a method and a computer readable storage medium, respectively, substantially in accordance with the apparatus of Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claims 16 and 31 are also now in condition for allowance and respectfully requests same.

### Claims 37 to 39

Claim 37 is directed to an information processing apparatus comprising: a holding unit adapted to hold print data; an issuing unit adapted to issue reference information corresponding to the print data held by said holding unit, to a plurality of printing apparatuses; a receiving unit adapted to receive an acquisition request of the print data, transmitted from any of the plurality of printing apparatuses based on the reference information; a judging unit adapted to judge whether or not the acquisition request received by said receiving unit is the acquisition request first received in regard to the print data; and a transmission control unit adapted to transmit the print data to the printing apparatus which transmitted the acquisition request in a case where it is judged by said judging unit that the received acquisition request is the first-received acquisition request or in a case where it is not judged by said judging unit that the received acquisition request is the first-received acquisition request and transmission of the print data to another printing apparatus failed, and not to transmit the print data to the printing apparatus which transmitted the acquisition request in a case where it is not judged by said judging unit that the received acquisition request is the first-received acquisition request and transmission of the print data to another printing apparatus has been completed.

Applicant submits that Mochizuki and Banno, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all of the features of Claim 37. As discussed above, Mochizuki does not disclose or suggest that, in the above case, the host computer transmits the print data to a printer which next responded to the retrieval packet. Furthermore, Banno does not at all consider, when the host computer determines the printer to which the print data is transmitted, whether the relevant printer requests to acquire the print data. In

other words, Banno merely considers, in case of determining the printer to which the print data is transmitted, only whether the number of errors is few. Therefore, Mochizuki and Banno, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest a transmission control unit adapted to transmit the print data to the printing apparatus which transmitted the acquisition request in a case where it is judged by said judging unit that the received acquisition request is the first-received acquisition request or in a case where it is not judged by said judging unit that the received acquisition request is the first-received acquisition request and transmission of the print data to another printing apparatus failed, and not to transmit the print data to the printing apparatus which transmitted the acquisition request in a case where it is not judged by said judging unit that the received acquisition request is the first-received acquisition request and transmission of the print data to another printing apparatus has been completed, as featured in Claim 37.

In light of this deficiency in Mochizuki and Banno, Applicant submits that independent Claim 37 is now in condition for allowance and respectfully requests same.

Claims 38 and 39 are directed to a method and a computer readable storage medium, respectively, substantially in accordance with the apparatus of Claim 37.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claims 38 and 39 are also now in condition for allowance and respectfully requests same.

The other pending claims in this application are each dependent from the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed allowable for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, CA office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Frank Cire Reg. #42,419/  
Frank L. Cire  
Attorney for Applicant

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3800  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA\_MAIN 128796v1